

**REGULAR MEETING OF  
LURAY PLANNING COMMISSION  
NOVEMBER 16, 2016**

The Luray Planning Commission met on Wednesday, November 16, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in regular session. The meeting was held in the Luray Town Council Chambers at 45 East Main Street, Luray, Virginia at which time there were present the following:

Commissioners Present:

Ronald Good  
Brian Sours  
Grace Nowak  
William Fisher  
Tracie Dickson

Absent:

Mark Malone  
John Shaffer

Others Present:

Charlie Hoke, Town Manager  
Ligon Webb, Town Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. and everyone joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A motion to approve the minutes of October 12, 2016 as corrected was made by Commissioner Brian Sours and seconded by Commissioner Nowak. The vote was as follows: YEA: Commissioners Good, Sours, Nowak, Fisher and Dickson. **APPROVED: 5-0**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

Commissioner Good stated the public hearing is to amend the sections dealing with two-family dwellings and square footage of the lots required. We discussed in general terms this proposed amendment last month and it has been properly advertised for public hearing to come before the Commission tonight.

Mr. Webb stated with regard to duplexes we are trying to change this so folks do not have to go out and get an extra lot. It is proposed that Appendix A (Zoning), Article III (Zoning Districts), Section 404 (High-Density Residential), 404.3 (Area Regulation), subsection (b) be amended. This subsection states for a two-family dwelling arranged side-by-side, each unit shall be

**MINUTES**  
**NOVEMBER 16, 2016**  
**PAGE 2**

assigned 4,000 square feet on the lot. A lot containing a two-family dwelling arranged side-by-side may be further divided into separate parcels for each dwelling unit, provided that the resulting lot size for each dwelling unit is a minimum of 4,000 square feet.

The proposed changes would amend this subsection to state: "For a two-family dwelling arranged side-by-side, each unit shall be assigned 3,250 square feet on the lot. A lot containing a two-family dwelling arranged side-by-side may be further divided into separate parcels for each dwelling unit, provided that the resulting lot size for each dwelling unit is a minimum of 3,250 square feet." If approved this would lower the required lot size for a two-family dwelling (duplex) from 4,000 square feet in area per side, to 3,250 square feet area per side.

Commissioner Good officially opened the Public Hearing for comments or questions.

**Mr. Michael Cabbage, 511 Fifth Avenue**

I do have some concerns as a homeowner. I have no complaints with adequate room for him to put a single-family dwelling there. I am against the duplexes for the fact that they are duplexes. It will bring the property value down and the ones that were already built in front of me have a nice big back yard for a town lot. If this is approved and Mr. Fox gets two duplexes on the corner of my property line. Ms. Housden was at the last meeting and I think she is ill and didn't make it to this meeting. It would be right on the property corner and so if it was approved for Mr. Fox then of course Mr. Cave has the adjoining property that was bigger than Mr. Fox's. I am against duplexes; they have duplexes in front and then it would be at least 4 or 5 behind me completely surrounded. At the end of the road there are at least 6 or 8 and maybe 10 going in at the end of the little cul-de-sac. The increased traffic and safety concern for the children in the neighborhood and you have the Ralph Dean Park with leagues and tournaments and increase in traffic on Fifth Street. Two vehicles meeting one way or the other, someone has to get over a little bit; the roads are not wide enough. It wasn't developed for that much high traffic. On Sixth; Mr. Fox's road, would be going to Ralph Dean Park. Police are patrolling it a lot more but the younger kids use it as a drag strip. I have no concern for his single-family dwellings; there is enough room there. Duplexes on the other hand; I am completely against it and the decrease in property value from the addition of duplexes.

**Mr. Steve Cave**

I just want to say I can respect Mr. Cabbage's opinion but the problem is that all of this was designed years ago and when I started with my project over on Sixth Street, it was changed to 8,000 square feet lot size; 4,000 per unit if you are going to sell it; if you are renting it's different; but if you are going to sell it, you have to have 4,000. I had to give up a 50 foot lot to make five of them work for that reason. I didn't want them real close anyway; I wanted 7 feet for each

**MINUTES**  
**NOVEMBER 16, 2016**  
**PAGE 3**

setback on the side even though it's 5 feet, so between the units I have 15 feet. I was against it from the beginning because these lots were designed and if you look at Second Street and look at Third Street all those down through there was built with the old setting. If you need 6,500 or 7,000 square feet, all of them built down through there were only built 18 feet wide. I was able to make mine 20 feet wide but I still had to put a setback on the side. It seems like with all these lots here it would be depriving the owners of their right to build when it's already a unit started down on the end of Fifth Street where he is talking about. The traffic has nothing to do with that over on Ralph Dean Park which already has a lot of traffic anyway. The ones I sell I use good grade materials; I don't cheaply build them. I put pride in my buildings and I respect what he says, but again it comes back to where you all want to amend it to get back to where it should be originally because people are going to build duplexes regardless if you have to purchase more land to build them. If you have to purchase more land, then you are going to try to build something else on there where you limit it to maybe two on those lots. Now you are going to be purchasing more land and you then buy yourself three or four because you are going to have to do that dollar wise to justify where the extra land is you have to buy.

Mr. Webb stated it's hard to dismiss the concerns that Mr. Cabbage has because he is the owner of a single-family home and the question is are the duplexes going to bring anything negative to the area. There is no question that there is going to be twice as much traffic and twice the people coming in and out. The duplex is to be put on 6,500 square feet. I think that is big enough to accommodate it and across the street from him they are all smaller lots. However, that was approved. It is an increase in density, you are going to have more people coming in and out of a duplex than you are a single-family home. There are several duplexes around them. This is R-4. If there is a place to build them, it is probably this area. I am comfortable with the 3,250 as far as being an adequate size. The traffic issue may be negative but I don't see it as being more negative than a single-family home. As far as property value, I think that is usually one of the first concerns folks have with anything that's new. I think in this area there are so many duplexes and multi-family housing already there, but the question for Mr. Cabbage is that he lives there. He likes for the neighborhood to stay like it is. From a policy point, I think Mr. Cave has some good points. We want to try to promote affordable housing because we know there is a need for it in the studies and this is the area for it. Based on that, I would still recommend approval. Obviously this is just a recommendation to the Town Council.

There being no other comments or concerns, Commissioner Good closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Nowak motioned that we table this until next month so we have a chance to visit the site. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Dickson with the vote as follows: YEA: Commissioners Good, Sours, Nowak, Fisher, and Dickson. **APPROVED: 5-0**

**MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 16, 2016  
PAGE 4**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- Initial Review: Potential Lord Fairfax Community College Rezoning Request

Mr. Webb gave a quick overview of the Community College. They are looking at several sites in Luray and have been offered five acres as a gift close to Wal-Mart and would potentially be an area for the campus. They would build a building and they have enough for parking and they would have to build this existing road into the parking lot. This whole area is part of the Baker Development that started in 3-15-2006. They have a planned neighborhood and you can see how they planned some of the lots. They want to give part of it to the Community College. I think it is a good idea to offer it to the Community College; to donate five acres so they could put their campus there. I think what you will see happen is more commercial development; office, restaurant; sidewalks. I see it as a business park. They have a couple other places they are looking at. They are supposed to get back with us soon and I believe they are going to move forward with it. If they are, they would rezone this from a PND to B-1. I believe they will come back in January. What needs to happen for it to be rezoned back to business. In business zoning district, schools and colleges are not a by-right use. So we probably need to go ahead and add that as a by-right use. It's probably a good idea just to do it anyway, so let's plan on advertising that for December. We would have that added if they come back in January for the rezoning, so we would add that to the Code.

- Future Triplex Requests

Mr. Webb stated Eric has a triplex he wants to do and he has the room for it. He needs a special use permit. Somewhere in R-4. He never got back to me where it was going to be. That's something that's going to be coming from Eric Fox.

There being no further business, a motion was made by Commissioner Nowak and seconded by Commissioner Sours that the meeting be adjourned. Motion carried.

Ligon Webb  
Town Planner

ATTEST:

---